



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,569	05/14/2004	Anchor Chen	NAUP0486USA3	3568

27765 7590 08/09/2004

NAIPO (NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE)
P.O. BOX 506
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

EXAMINER

ABRAHAM, FETSUM

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2826

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/709,569

Applicant(s)

CHEN, ANCHOR

Examiner

Fetsum Abraham

Art Unit

2826

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) the rest is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 17 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6,8-16,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norstrom et al (6,657,242).

As for claims 1,14, the patent discloses a bipolar transistor in figure 7 and 13b composed of a substrate, a dielectric layer (147) on the substrate having an opening to expose a portion of the substrate, a doped polysilicon sidewall (129) on the periphery of the opening to define a base region underneath the opening, an intrinsic doped base region as shown in figure 5 at the bottom of the opening, a spacer (131) on the polysilicon sidewalls to define emitter region (143) established by a conductive filler and a PN junction formed between the base and the emitter regions. Although the claim terminologies are not necessarily used to express the same elements in the patent (such as 'self aligned", and "base region defines by the heavily doped polysilicon layer") it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to conclude that all claimed elements are addressed by the patent since expression terminologies are variable and subjective in nature.

As for claims 2-5,15 the polysilicon layer is made from a heavily boron doped material and the substrate is silicon. As for the expression "non-selective " to define the

Art Unit: 2826

substrate, the expression is considered to be subjective that does not have physical feature differentiating it from the silicon substrate in the prior art.

As for claims 6,16, it is clear that silicidation process is inherent to the emitter electrode formed on the highly doped emitter interface. Beyond that, silicides are notoriously known contact materials in the art that are used to accommodate the resistivity difference between highly doped semiconductors and pure metals.

As for claims 8,9, the polysilicon layer is extended on the substrate beyond the periphery of the opening. Although the extension is the same continuous material, it is clear that the end performance of joined conductive pieces and the single conductor in the prior art is similar.

As for claims 11,18, a deep isolation trench segregates the active structure laterally from other elements in the substrate.

As for claims 13,19 the intrinsic doped base region is made from boron implant.

Claims 7,17,18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fetsum Abraham whose telephone number is: 571-272-1911. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 18:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915.

Fetsum Abraham
8/5/04

